

**U.S. District Court
Northern District of Ohio (Cleveland)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:07-cv-01438-LW
Internal Use Only**

SOLICITOR

JUL 27 2007

U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Monsanto Company, et al v. Stoffer
Assigned to: Hon. Lesley Wells
Cause: 35:271 Patent Infringement

Date Filed: 05/16/2007
Date Terminated: 06/19/2007
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 830 Patent
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

Monsanto Company

**Pat. # 5,352,605
Re 39,247E**

represented by **Jeff A. Masson**

Frilot Partridge
3600 Energy Centre
1100 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70163
504-599-8000
Fax: 504-599-8100
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Joel E. Cape
Frilot Partridge
3600 Energy Centre
1100 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70163
504-599-8000
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

John Winship Read
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease - Cleveland
2100 One Cleveland Center
1375 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
216-479-6103
Fax: 216-479-6060
Email: jwread@vssp.com
LEAD ATTORNEY

Elizabeth A. Ratliff
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease - Cleveland
2100 One Cleveland Center
1375 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
216-479-6191
Fax: 216-479-6060
Email: earatliff@vssp.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

**OFFICE OF THE
GENERAL COUNSEL**

2007 JUL 23 PM 1:34

**U.S. PATENT
AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Plaintiff

33. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284, Monsanto is entitled to damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, although in no event less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs to be taxed to the infringer. Further, damages should be trebled pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 in light of the Defendant's knowing, willful, conscious, and deliberate infringement of the patent rights at issue.

34. The infringing activity of the Defendant brings this cause within the ambit of the exceptional case contemplated by 35 U.S.C. §285, thus Monsanto requests the award of reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

35. Monsanto demands trial by jury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, Monsanto Company and Monsanto Technology, LLC prays that process and due form of law issue to Defendant, Douglas Stoffer, requiring him to appear and answer the allegations of this complaint, and that after due proceedings are had, there be judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and against the Defendant, providing the following remedies to Plaintiffs:

1. Entry of judgment for damages, together with interest and costs, to compensate Monsanto for the Defendant's patent infringement;
2. Trebling of damages awarded for the infringement of patents together with reasonable attorney's fees;
3. Entry of an order prohibiting the Defendant from planting, transferring, or selling the infringing articles to a third party;
4. Entry of a permanent injunction against the Defendant to prevent the Defendant from using, saving, cleaning, or planting any of Monsanto's proprietary seed technologies, without express written permission from Monsanto;
5. Entry of judgment for costs, expenses, and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by Monsanto; and
6. Such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John Winship Read

John Winship Read (0030827)

Elizabeth A. Ratliff (0075673)

Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP

2100 One Cleveland Center

1375 East Ninth Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Telephone: (216) 479-6103

Facsimile: (216) 937-3737

E-mail: jwread@vssp.com

earatliff@vssp.com

Of Counsel:

Joel E. Cape (La. #26001)

Jeff A. Masson (La. #28674)

Frilot Partridge, L.C.

1100 Poydras Street, 3600 Energy Centre

New Orleans, Louisiana 70163

Telephone: (504) 599-8000

Facsimile: (504) 599-8100

*Attorneys for Monsanto Company and
Monsanto Technology, LLC*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

MONSANTO COMPANY, et al.,)
) CASE NO. 1:07CV 1438
)
) Plaintiffs,)
)
)
) -vs-) ORDER OF DISMISSAL
)
) DOUGLAS STOFFER,)
)
)
) Defendant.)
)
)
)

OFFICE OF THE
GENERAL COUNSEL
2007 JUL 23 PM 1:35
U.S. PATENT
AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE LESLEY WELLS

This case is before the Court on the plaintiffs' – Monsanto Company and Monsanto Technology, LLC – notice to dismiss the instant matter without prejudice against defendant Douglas Stoffer. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(i) this case is dismissed without prejudice against Mr. Stoffer. Each party shall bear its own fees and costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Lesley Wells
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: 19 June 2007

Monsanto Technology, LLC

represented by **Jeff A. Masson**

(See above for address)

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Joel E. Cape

(See above for address)

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

John Winship Read

(See above for address)

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Elizabeth A. Ratliff

(See above for address)

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

Douglas Stoffer

TERMINATED: 06/19/2007

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
05/16/2007	<u>1</u>	Complaint against Douglas Stoffer (Filing fee 350 receipt number 247004.). Filed by Monsanto Company, Monsanto Technology, LLC. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A# <u>2</u> Exhibit B # <u>3</u> Civil Cover Sheet # <u>4</u> Summons)(Read, John) Modified on 5/17/2007 (K, K). (Entered: 05/16/2007)
05/16/2007	<u>2</u>	Corporate Disclosure Statement filed by Monsanto Company. (Read, John) (Entered: 05/16/2007)
05/16/2007	<u>3</u>	Corporate Disclosure Statement filed by Monsanto Technology, LLC. (Read, John) (Entered: 05/16/2007)
05/17/2007	<u>4</u>	Judge Lesley Wells assigned to case. (K, K) (Entered: 05/17/2007)
05/17/2007	<u>5</u>	Random Assignment of Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 3.1. In the event of a referral, case will be assigned to Magistrate Judge McHargh. (K, K) (Entered: 05/17/2007)
05/17/2007	<u>6</u>	Summons and Magistrate Consent Form issued to counsel for service upon Douglas Stoffer. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Magistrate Consent Form) (K, K) (Entered: 05/17/2007)
05/22/2007	<u>7</u>	Return of Service Executed upon Douglas Stoffer by Hand-delivery on May 18, 2007 filed by Monsanto Company, Monsanto Technology, LLC Related document(s) <u>3</u> , <u>2</u> , <u>1</u> , <u>4</u> . (Ratliff, Elizabeth) (Entered: 05/22/2007)
05/24/2007	<u>8</u>	Motion for attorney Joel Cape to Appear Pro Hac Vice Filing fee 100, receipt number 2481833. filed by Monsanto Company, Monsanto Technology, LLC. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A)(Ratliff, Elizabeth) (Entered: 05/24/2007)
05/24/2007	<u>9</u>	Motion for attorney Jeff Masson to Appear Pro Hac Vice Filing fee 100, receipt number 2481913. filed by Monsanto Company, Monsanto Technology, LLC. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A)(Ratliff, Elizabeth) (Entered: 05/24/2007)

06/14/2007	● <u>8</u>	Notice of Dismissal Under FRCP 41(a)(1) filed by Monsanto Company, Monsanto Technology, LLC. (Ratliff, Elizabeth) (Entered: 06/14/2007)
06/19/2007	●	Order [Non Document] Granting Motion for appearance pro hac vice. Attorney Joel E. Cape is added as counsel for Monsanto Company and Monsanto Technology, LLC (Related Doc # <u>6</u>) (Entered on behalf of Judge Lesley Wells on 6/19/07)(C,LS) (Entered: 06/19/2007)
06/19/2007	●	Order [Non Document] Granting Motion for appearance pro hac vice; Attorney Jeff A. Masson is added as counsel for Monsanto Company and Monsanto Technology, LLC (Related Doc # <u>7</u>) (Entered on behalf of Judge Lesley Wells on 6/19/07)(C,LS) (Entered: 06/19/2007)
06/19/2007	● <u>9</u>	Order and Notice of Party Dismissal of Douglas Stoffer pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(i) without prejudice, each party shall bear its own fees and costs. Signed by Judge Lesley Wells on 6/19/07.(E,P) (Entered: 06/19/2007)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

MONSANTO COMPANY and
MONSANTO TECHNOLOGY, LLC
800 North Lindbergh Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63167

Plaintiffs.

vs.

DOUGLAS STOFFER
1060 State Rt. 96
Shiloh, Ohio 44878

Defendant.

CASE NO.:

JUDGE:

OFFICE OF THE
GENERAL COUNSEL
2007 JUL 23 PM 1:35
U.S. PATENT
AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

COMES NOW the Plaintiffs, Monsanto Company, and Monsanto Technology, LLC (sometimes referred to collectively as "Monsanto") through undersigned counsel, and for its Complaint at law against Douglas Stoffer (hereinafter "Stoffer" or "Defendant") makes the following allegations:

THE PLAINTIFFS

1. Monsanto Company is a company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business in St. Louis, Missouri. It is authorized to do and is doing business in Ohio and this judicial district.

2. Monsanto Technology, LLC is a company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business in St. Louis, Missouri.

THE DEFENDANT

3. Defendant, Douglas Stoffer, is an individual who has attained the age of majority and is a resident and domiciliary of Richland County, Ohio.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred upon this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, in that one or more of Monsanto's claims arise under the laws of the United States, as well as 28 U.S.C. §1338, granting district courts original jurisdiction over any civil action regarding patents.

5. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1400 as Douglas Stoffer resides in this judicial district, and as a substantial number of the events giving rise to Monsanto's claims of patent infringement occurred within this judicial district.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

6. Monsanto Company is in the business of developing, manufacturing, licensing, and selling agricultural biotechnology, agricultural chemicals, and agricultural products. After the investment of substantial time, expense, and expertise, Monsanto Company developed a plant biotechnology that involves the transfer of a gene into crop seed that causes the plant to be resistant to glyphosate-based herbicides such as Roundup Ultra®, Roundup UltraMAX®, Roundup WeatherMAX®, and Touchdown®.

7. This biotechnology has been utilized by Monsanto Company in soybeans. The genetically improved soybeans are marketed by Monsanto Company as Roundup Ready® soybeans.

8. Monsanto's Roundup Ready® biotechnology is protected under United States Patent Numbers 5,352,605 and RE 39,247 E, which are attached hereto as Exhibits "A"

and "B". The 5,352,605 and RE 39,247 E patents (commonly referred to as the '605 and '247 patents, respectively) were issued prior to the events giving rise to this action.

9. Monsanto Technology, LLC is and has been the owner of the '605 and '247 patents prior to the events giving rise to this action.¹

10. Monsanto Company is and has been the exclusive licensee of the '605 and '247 patents from Monsanto Technology, LLC prior to the events giving rise to this action.

11. Since the Roundup Ready® technology was commercially introduced, Monsanto Company has labeled all bags of Roundup Ready® soybeans sold in the United States with the required statutory notice that the Roundup Ready® soybean seed was patented.

12. Monsanto Company licenses the use of Roundup Ready® seed technology to soybean producers at the retail marketing level through a limited use license commonly referred to as a Technology Agreement.

13. Among other things, the express terms of the limited use license prohibits licensees from saving harvested Roundup Ready® soybeans for planting purposes, or from selling, transferring or supplying saved Roundup Ready® soybeans to others for planting. The use of the seed is limited to the production of a single commercial crop.

14. Monsanto does not authorize the planting of saved (sometimes referred to as bin run and/or brown bag) Roundup Ready® soybeans. The planting of saved Roundup Ready® soybean seed is an infringement of Monsanto's patent rights.

¹ Monsanto Technology, LLC is a holding company for the intellectual property rights of Monsanto Company.

15. Defendant farms land in Richland County, Ohio, upon which he produces soybeans. In particular, Defendant planted approximately 170 acres of soybeans in 2006.

16. In summer of 2006, Monsanto requested information from Douglas Stoffer about his 2006 soybean farming operations, and particularly concerning his use of Roundup Ready® soybeans. The information sought included the number of acres planted, the source of the soybean seed planted, and the defendants' permission to collect records pertaining to his soybean crop.

17. The purpose of asking Defendant for this information was to determine the extent of his use of Roundup Ready® soybeans and to ascertain whether he had planted saved Roundup Ready® soybeans. This information can only be obtained from the grower.

18. Defendant admitted that he had planted saved Roundup Ready® soybeans during the 2006 crop year, but he has refused to discuss settlement of Monsanto's infringement claim.

19. Upon information and belief, the Defendant knowingly, willfully and intentionally planted and used saved Roundup Ready® soybeans without authorization from Monsanto in violation of Monsanto's patent rights.

COUNT ONE-PATENT INFRINGEMENT-Patent No. 5,352,605

20. Each and every allegation set forth in the above-numbered paragraphs is hereby incorporated by reference just as if it was explicitly set forth hereunder.

21. On October 4, 1994, United States Patent Number 5,352,605 was duly and legally issued to Monsanto for an invention in Chimeric Genes for Transforming Plant

Cells Using Viral Promoters, and since that date, Monsanto has been the owner of this patent. This invention is in the fields of genetic engineering and plant biology.

22. Monsanto placed the required statutory notice that its Roundup Ready® technology was protected by United States Patent Number 5,352,605 on the labeling of all bags containing Roundup Ready® soybean seed in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §287.

23. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes the unauthorized use of a patented invention within the United States during the term of Patent Number 5,352,605, all in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271. Accordingly, Monsanto has a right of civil action against the Defendant pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §281.

24. Defendant has infringed Monsanto's patent rights by making, using, offering for sale, selling, or otherwise transferring Roundup Ready® soybean seed embodying the patented invention without authorization from Monsanto, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this court.

25. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §283, Monsanto is entitled to injunctive relief in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent the infringement of rights secured by its patents.

26. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284, Monsanto is entitled to damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, although in no event less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs to be taxed to the infringer. Further, damages should be trebled pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 in light of the Defendant's knowing, willful, conscious, and deliberate infringement of the patent rights at issue.

27. The infringing activity of the Defendant brings this cause within the ambit of the exceptional case contemplated by 35 U.S.C. §285, thus Monsanto requests the award of reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

COUNT TWO-PATENT INFRINGEMENT-Patent No. RE 39,247 E

28. Each and every allegation set forth in the above-numbered paragraphs is hereby incorporated by reference just as if it was explicitly set forth hereunder.

29. On August 22, 2006, United States Patent Number 5,633,435 was duly and legally reissued to Monsanto as U.S. Patent No. RE 39,247 E. U.S. Patent No. 5,633,435 was initially issued on May 27, 1997. The '247 patent is for an invention of Glyphosate-Tolerant 5-Enolpyruvylshikimate-3-Phospate Synthases. This invention is in the fields of genetic engineering and plant biology.

30. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes the unauthorized use of a patented invention within the United States during the term of Patent Number RE 39,247 E, all in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271. Accordingly, Monsanto has a right of civil action against the Defendant pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §281.

31. Defendant has infringed Monsanto's patent rights by making, using, offering for sale, selling, or otherwise transferring Roundup Ready® soybean seed embodying the patented invention without authorization from Monsanto, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this court.

32. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §283, Monsanto is entitled to injunctive relief in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent the infringement of rights secured by its patents.